



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/346,719	07/02/1999	ANA GABRIELA ANAYA	09857/018001	2808
26161 7590 10/17/2005 FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER BASHORE, ALAIN L	
			ART UNIT 1762	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/346,719

Applicant(s)

ANAYA ET AL.

Examiner

Alain L. Bashore

Art Unit

1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 22-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 27-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Re-issue of previous office action***

1. The previous office action is re-issued to provide for timely reconsideration with second level review in Class 705. Any change in status because of second level review response obtained before the 3 month statutory time period expires will be communicated to applicant.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 44-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of (Zusman et al and Kampe et al) in further view of Lange.

Wilson discloses market event data received by a plurality of feed lines (fig 1) which is then translated into common formats (col 2, lines 38-44; col 6, lines 61-67; col 7, lines 1-7; col 7, lines 39-55). Mechanisms (fig 1) receive the data after it has been processed by a gateway (1) which is then disseminated. A private network is disclosed (col 4, lines 5-16).

Wilson also discloses placing time data on incoming messages as a means of accurately identifying and flagging messages for later processing (col 6, lines 45 et seq) and to provide an platform compatibility to facilitate network communications over disparate network architectures and protocols (col 4, lines 1 et seq).

Wilson discloses market session data (col 5, lines 4-10), line (col 5, lines 60-67; col 6, lines 1-4), feed (col 4, lines 52-59), message type (col 6, lines 52-67), and original identification (col 5, lines 26-32).

Since the mechanisms to Wilson include processors that manipulate data, there are “engines” present. Since data is disseminated there is present “publishing”.

Since Wilson’s gateway describes processing constrains (col 7, lines 10-14) and use of a buffer (col 6, lines 5-11), there must be present data with FIFO constraints, thus market event data in a “queue”.

Wilson does not disclose:

- attaching timing data to the received message, including time extracted from the received message, and a stamp indicating receipt time at the receiver object and other data;

- activating a function to translate received message into market event data;
- receiving in an object or activation of objects to perform recited functions – i.e. the use of object oriented language (as now claimed in claims 44, 53, and 55);

a stamp indicating a receipt time at the receiver function;  
time comparison of messages as recited in claims 45, 54, and 56;  
sequence number registration or updating;  
validation of market event data further including with: gap data, duplicate  
message discarding/tracking; and,  
fields within a market event object format.

Zusman et al discloses translating a portion of received messages into messages having a common format (col 6, lines 26-31).

Kampe et al discloses market event data as received messages (col 1, lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to translate received messages into market event messages to Wilson because of what is taught by Kampe et al and Zusman et al.

Kampe et al teaches that received messages having market event data must be continuously updated in a synchronous and compatible fashion ( col 1, lines 20-67; col 2, lines 1-36). Zusman et al teaches accuracy and timeliness of financial data (col 2, lines 5-10) including standardization of message formats for delivery purposes (col 6, lines 25-42).

Zusman et al discloses a time stamp (col 9, line 8) for input messages, time comparison of blocks of messages (col 9, lines 19-22), sequence number registration and updating (col 10, line 11), validation of market event data with: gap data (col 9, lines 28-29), duplicate message discarding/tracking (col 9, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include sequence number registration and updating because Zusman et al teaches assigning sequence numbers for the purposes of message validation (col 10, lines 9-11) and updating for purposes of data manipulation (col 15, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include validation of market event data because Zusman et al teaches regional users require customized services (col 4, lines 15-16).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include validation of market event data with: gap data and duplicate message discarding/tracking because Zusman et al teaches such for purposes of message consistency requirements (col 9, line 18).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a stamp for a receipt time to Wilson because Zusman et al teaches that a stamp is a conventional header for input messages (col 9, lines 8-9).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include time comparisons as recited in claims 45, 54, and 56 because Zusman et al teaches correction by requesting re-submission if data included with the message is inconsistent with protocol (col 9, lines 22-34).

Wilson in view of (Zusman et al and Kampe et al) does not further disclose:

receiving in an object or activation objects to perform functions – i.e. the use of object oriented language.

Lange discloses the use of object-oriented language (col 90, lines 35-67).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include object or activation objects to perform functions because of what is taught by Lange. Lange teaches as common for servers that receive market data to utilize object oriented techniques (col 90 , lines 42-44).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include fields within a market event object format because Kampe et al describes messages as inherently having information within fields (col 5, line 13).


**Conclusion**

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 571-272-6739. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Mon. thru Thurs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Regarding all Class 705 applications, the management contact regarding examination is: Vincent Millin (SPE, art unit 3624) at 571-272-6747.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Alain L. Bashore  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1762